



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Handwritten signature/initials

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,335	04/09/2004	Paul D. Wightman	58562US005	9992
32692 7590 01/11/2008 3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			EXAMINER DESAI, RITA J	
			ART UNIT 1625	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com
LegalDocketing@mmm.com

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">10/821,335</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">WIGHTMAN ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Rita J. Desai</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">1625</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 and 15-51 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</p> <p>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)</p> <p>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|---|---|

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-9, 11-14 are under consideration. Claims 10, 15-51 have been withdrawn.

The rejection of the claims 1-9 and 11 under 35 USC 102 and 103 over US'338 (Gerster), US '129 (Miller), and US '060 (Slade) still stands.

Applicants argue that their compounds are covalently bonded to the macro molecule whereas in the prior art is just admixed is not found to be convincing.

By amended the claims applicants assert that it is covalently bonded. There is no showing or examples of the bonding, at which position or between which groups this bonding exists. When the same two reacts are present in the same condition, it would be obvious that the reaction or attachment would be the same.

In the absence of such showing it can be assumed to be the same as that of the prior art.

Applicant do not have a single example or guidance of the biotin (Vitamin H) linkage nor of a covalent linkage. The IRM molecule is a has many different groups and there is no showing to what group it is covalently bonded.

The rejection thus still stands.

The rejection of the claims 1-9, 11-14 under 35 USC 112 still stands.

Applicant argue that on page 32 formula 1 and page 34 lines 17 and 18 discloses the possible sites on the IRM compounds. They further argue that the reaction is between the functional group on the biotin and the IRM forms a covalent bond.

Applicants further argue that in examples 2-11 and IRM containing a triethoxysilyl group was reacted with a SiO₂.

It should be noted that applicants claims are not limited to the the Silica-O-Si-IRM bond.

Applicants claims read an IRM support complex comprising an IRM compound covalently bonded to a macromolecular support material , or attached via a biotin linkage that comprises a high affinity non-covalent interaction.

First of all , what is the macromolecular support? It is not limited to applicants Silica. Secondly the functional language attached via a biotin linkage (Vitamin H) that comprises a high affinity non-covalent interaction (can read on H bonding).

With the vague language the full scope cannot be clearly determined and also chemical art of making compounds with specific bonding is not easy.

See the preface As stated in the preface to a recent treatise:

"Most non-chemists would probably be horrified if they wereto learn how many attempted syntheses fail, and how inefficient research chemists are. The ratio of successful to unsuccessful chemical experiments in a normal research laboratory is far below unity, and synthetic research chemists, in the same way as most scientists, spend most of their time working out what went wrong, and why. Despite the many pitfalls lurking in organic synthesis, most organic chemistry textbooks and research articles do give the impression that organic reactions just proceed smoothly and that the total synthesis of complex natural products, for instance, is maybe a labor-intensive but otherwise undemanding task. In fact, most syntheses of structurally complex natural products are the result of several years of hard work by a team of chemists, with almost

every step requiring careful optimization. The final synthesis usually looks quite different from that originally planned, because of unexpected difficulties encountered in the initially chosen synthetic sequence. Only the seasoned practitioner who has experienced for himself the many failures and frustrations which the development (sometimes even the repetition) of a synthesis usually implies will be able to appraise such workChemists tend not to publish negative results, because these are, as opposed to positive results, never definite (and far too copious) " Dorwald F. A.

Side Reactions in Organic Synthesis, 2005, Wiley: VCH, Weinheim pg. IX of Preface.

Side Reactions in Organic Synthesis. Florencio Zaragoza Dörwald
Copyright © 2005 WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim
ISBN: 3-527-31021-5

7 Synthesis Design

The synthesis of a structurally complex compound requires careful retrosynthetic analysis to identify the shortest synthetic strategies which are most likely to give rapid access to the target compound, ideally in high yield and purity. It is critical to keep the synthesis as short as possible, because, as discussed throughout this book, each reaction can cause unexpected problems, especially when working with structurally complex intermediates. Also for synthesis of "simple-looking" structures several different approaches should be considered, because even structurally simple compounds often turn out not to be so easy to make as initially thought.

The whole book talks about the difficulties in making compounds.

Thus the state of the art is full of uncertainties and applicants have not provided any guidance on how to make these complexes.

Applicants give some examples of compounds with an oxane bond but that certainly does not commensurate with the claims.

The only compound made is IRM2.

It does not show the bonding.

The claims as written correspond to any IRM as given in claim 7 attached via a covalent linkage to a support.

Applicant claims do not specify the biotin-avidin interaction.

The rejection still stands.

Conclusion

Claims 1-9 and 1-14 still stand rejected.

Claims 10, 15-51 are withdrawn.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Application/Control Number:
10/821,335
Art Unit: 1625

Page 6

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita J. Desai whose telephone number is 571-272-0684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, flex time..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rita J. Desai
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625

R. Desai
1/6/08

R.D.
January 6, 2008